

105-97278

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 30 MAR 2005
WIPO PCT

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:  
TURLOCK, LANCE A.  
Meridian Patent Services  
#471 - 7231 - 120th Street  
DELTA, British Columbia  
Canada, V4C 6P5

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)		23 March 2005 (23-03-2005)																
Applicant's or agent's file reference		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below																
Applicant's or agent's file reference	FRE0201 PCT																	
International application No.	International filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)																
PCT/CA2004/002212	29 December 2004 (29-12-2004)	23 January 2004 (23-01-2004)																
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC7 H04N 5/64 Cross-referenced H04N 5/655, H05K 7/00																		
Applicant FREEMAN, BASIL NORMAN																		
<p>1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items :</p> <table><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I</td><td>Basis of the opinion</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II</td><td>Priority</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III</td><td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV</td><td>Lack of unity of invention</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V</td><td>Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement.</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI</td><td>Certain documents cited</td></tr><tr><td><input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII</td><td>Certain defects in the international application</td></tr><tr><td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII</td><td>Certain observations on the international application</td></tr></table>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I	Basis of the opinion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement.	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I	Basis of the opinion																	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II	Priority																	
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																	
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement.																	
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																	
<input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																	
<p>2. FURTHER ACTION</p> <p>If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.</p> <p>If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.</p> <p>For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>																		
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.																		
Name and mailing address of the ISA/CA Canadian Intellectual Property Office Place du Portage I, C114 - 1st Floor, Box PCT 50 Victoria Street Gatineau, Quebec K1A 0C9		Authorized officer  Arvo Taagepera (819) 997-3089																
Facsimile No: 001(819)953-2476																		

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/CA2004/002212

**Box No. I      Basis of this opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
  
[ ] This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language \_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of :
  - a. type of material
    - [ ] a sequence listing
    - [ ] table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material
    - [ ] in written format
    - [ ] in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing
    - [ ] contained in the international application as filed.
    - [ ] filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - [ ] furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. [ ] In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statement that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments :

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/CA2004/002212

Box No. II

Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not yet been furnished :

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary :

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/CA2004/002212

**Box No. V**      **Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(I) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1 - 16</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1 - 16</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1 - 16</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>NONE</u>	NO

**2. Citations and explanations :**

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: US 6 831 829      (EINHORN)      14 December 2004      (06-12-2004)  
Abstract;  
Col. 4 lines 11-26;  
Col. 5 line 62 - col. 6 line 8;  
Col. 7 lines 4-18

D2: US 6 587 082      (MOORE)      1 July 2003      (01-07-2003)  
Abstract;  
Col. 7 lines 11-32 and 39-45  
Col. 8 lines 29-55

Applicant discloses and claims a video display apparatus with an extendable and retractable "thin-screen" or "flat panel" type display screen, the screen being lifted vertically up and out from a cabinet. The cabinet contains a motor-driven belt drive for the purposes of vertically lifting and lowering the screen resting on an "elevator platform". A flexible and foldable ribbon-cable connects the movable screen to the immovable components in the cabinet. Prior art devices are said to have lifted and lowered the entire TV or computer into and out of its cabinet, resulting in heavy weight having to be lifted, whereas the inventive arrangement profits from the low weight of the thin screen by lifting and lowering only the screen and none of the other components.

D1 discloses a flat panel display screen which is vertically movable to be lifted in and out of its cabinet. Only the thin screen is lifted or lowered, any other heavier components remaining in the cabinet. A flexible and foldable ribbon-cable connects the movable screen to the immovable components in the cabinet. The cabinet contains motor-driven "lifting columns" for the purposes of lifting and lowering the screen. D1 thus discloses all the major features of claims 1-16 rendering them obvious. Although D1 falls between applicant's claimed priority date and filing date, D1 has been maintained of record for information purposes.

In D1, the lifting and lowering of the video display screen is not brought about by the specific means of a "platform" actuated by a "belt drive", but rather by equivalent lifting columns. It would seem to be immaterial which particular lifting means are used.

D2 discloses retractable thin screen display panels retracted and extended by a pivoting i.e. rotating movement. The screens may be extended or retracted manually, or by an electric motor. D2 thus discloses all the major features of claims 1-16 rendering them obvious.

D2 does not have a "platform" actuated by a belt drive. In D2, the extension and retraction of the screens appears to take place on the horizontal plane and not vertically. It would seem to be immaterial whether the extension and retraction takes place vertically or horizontally.

Continued in SUPPLEMENTAL BOX

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/CA2004/002212

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made :

Item 161 appearing in the drawing Figures 2 and 3 is not described in the disclosure, contravening Rule 5.1(a)(v) PCT.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/CA2004/002212

**Supplemental Box**

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation from BOX V

**Novelty under Article 33(2) PCT**

None of the documents D1 - D2 discloses a video display screen being retracted and extended by an "elevator platform driven by a drive belt".

Claims 1-16 therefore possess novelty under **Article 33(2) PCT**.

**Inventive step under Article 33(3) PCT**

The features claimed throughout claims 1-16 of using a "platform" to lift the screen and a "drive belt" to move the platform are obvious commonplace ones, and widely used in the public domain for lifting any objects one might wish to lift. The most common method of lifting something is to put a platform underneath the object to be lifted, and to apply some upward lifting force to the platform. Similarly, a "swivel permitting rotational movement" merely uses a swivel for its intended purposes of rotating. The claimed features of a "platform", "drive belt" and "swivel" would therefore be seen to be obvious and not constituting inventive steps distinguishing over D1 and D2.

Claims 1-16 therefore lack an inventive step under **Article 33(3) PCT**.

**Industrial applicability under Article 33(4) PCT**

The subject matter of a video display apparatus having an extendable and retractable "thin-screen" or "flat panel" type display screen capable of being extended and retracted from a cabinet is industrially practicable and reproducible.

Claims 1-16 possess industrial applicability under **Article 33(4) PCT**.